HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR
DIVISION BENCH

CORAM : HON'BLE SHRI JAGDISH BHALLA, Ag C.J.
HON'BLE SHRI DILIP RAOSAHEB DESHMUKH, J.

Writ Appeal No.55 of 2007

APPELLANT PETITIONER

Smt Shashikala Anchal W/o Shri Joharilal Ancha, aged about 19 yers, occupation – Anganbadi Worker, resident of Village Domanpur, Gram Panchayat Domanpur, PostKishungarh, Tahsil and Block – Pandariya, District Kabeerdham (CG)

Vs.

REPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary Panchayat and Social Department Mantralay, DKS Building, Raipur (CG)
2. The Director, Women and Child Development Department Chhattisgarh, Raipur, Tahsil and District Raipur (CG)
3. The Additional Collector Kabeerdham, District Kabeerdham (CG)
4. The Project Officer, Integrated Child Development Pandariya, Block Pandariya District Kabeerdham (CG)
5. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Pandariya, Tahsil Pandariya, District Kabeerdham (CG)
6. Smt Kamlesh Baghel W/o Jagdish Prasad Baghel, aged about 21 years, resident of village – Domanpur, Gram Kishungarh Tahsil and Block Pandariya, District Kabeerdham (CG)

Present : Shri Sunil Sahu, counsel for the appellant.

Shri Indrasen Sahu, counsel for respondent No.6.

Shri NK Agrawal, Dy Advocate General for the State.

68

ORAL ORDER

(Passed on 26th June, 2007)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Jagdish Bhalla, Ag CJ.**

This writ appeal arises out of the judgment dated 29.01.2007 delivered by Hon'ble Single Judge. The order under challenge before the Single Judge was the appointment of respondent No.6 to the post of Anganwadi worker by an order dated 30.12.2006.

Petitioner/appellant's sole contention before Hon'ble Single Judge was that the required qualification for appointment of the post referred to hereinabove is 8th Class and respondent No.6 has admittedly obtained 54% marks whereas the petitioner has passed Class 8th in supplementary examination.

The petitioner/appellant had further contended before Hon'ble Single Judge that the petitioner is living below poverty line. However, he could not indicate before Hon'ble Single Judge whether respondent No.6 was not living below poverty line.

Counsel for the appellant could not show any law on the basis of which we can interfere with the order passed by Hon'ble Single Judge. We are in full agreement with the view expressed by Hon'ble Single Judge. The appeal is devoid of merit, accordingly, it is dismissed.

Sd/-
Acting Chief Justice

Sd/-
Dilip Raosaheb Deshmukh
Judge

padma